UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/838,239	04/20/2001	Srikanth Natarajan	10007591/020	9191

7590   10/18/2007
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
SHAW, PELING ANDY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2144	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/18/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

MAILED

Application Number: 09/838,239
Filing Date: April 20, 2001
Appellant(s): NATARAJAN ET AL.

OCT 18 :::7

Technology Center 2100

Patrick Keane
<u>For Appellant</u>

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 07/06/2007 appealing from the Office action mailed 01/16/2007.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or

be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the

brief.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in

the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal in the

brief is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

US 5577252 A   Nelson et al.   11-1996

WO 00/49769   Lecheler et al.   02-1999

US 5948055 A   Pulsipher et al.   09-1999

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

1. Claims 1-4 and 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Lecheler et al. (WO 00/49769), hereinafter referred as Lecheler, in view of Nelson et al.

(US 5577252 A), hereinafter referred as Nelson.

   a.   Lecheler shows (claim 1) a method of managing a computer network, comprising

the steps of: assigning to at least one collection computer a management domain

identifier uniquely associated with a management domain in which each collection

computer resides; receiving, in at least one management computer (Fig. 3, item 92:

network node manager), information from the at least one collection computer that

includes the management domain identifier; and maintaining within the at least one

management computer a database (Fig. 3, item 84: mapping table) of the information

accessed using the management domain identifier (Title, Abstract, Figures 1 and 3,

page 10 lines 7-19, page 1 3 lines 20-23). Lecheler does not explicitly show (claim 1)

a trust flag to indicate a binary setting and deciding whether the at least one

management computer should resolve a hostname being reported by the at least one

collection computer based on the binary setting of the trust flag. However Lecheler

does show exploration of art and/or provided a reason to modify the method of

managing a computer network with additional features such as the trust/security

feature (page 5 lines 2-11, page 19 lines 11-17).

b.   Nelson shows (claim 1) a trust flag to indicate a binary setting and deciding

whether the at least one management computer should resolve a hostname being

reported by the at least one collection computer based on the binary setting of the

trust flag (column 1 line 54-column 2 line 2; column 6 line 62-column 7 line 18;

column 9 lines 1-23; column 11 line 65- column 12, line 2: name resolution based

upon trust) in an analogous art for the purpose of implementing secure name servers

in an object-oriented system.

c.   It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention was made to modify Lecheler's functions of remote management of

private networks having duplicate network addresses with Nelson's functions of name

resolution based on trust.

d.   The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art

would have been motivated to include the name resolution based on trust technique

per Nelson's teaching in management systems per Lecheler (lines 2-11 on page 5)

and Nelson (column 1, lines 14-21)'s teaching.

e.   Regarding claim 2, Lecheler shows wherein the step of assigning comprises the

step of: establishing at least one management domain, wherein each management

domain includes at least one collection computer (Figures 1 and 3, page 8 lines 10-31,

page 12 lines 7-20).

f.   Regarding claim 3, Lecheler shows wherein the management domain identifier is

a domain name of the management domain (page 10 line 26-page 11 line 13).

g.   Regarding claim 4, Lecheler shows wherein the information is network topology

information (page 13 lines 14-23, page 15 lines 13-28, page 18 lines 3-11).

h.   Regarding claim 7, Lecheler shows comprising the step of: managing, by each

collection computer, at least one network object; and resolving, by each collection

computer, a network address of each network object into a resolved network address

included in the information received at the at least one management computer (page

10 lines 7-19, page 1 5 lines 13-28).

i.   Claim 8 is of the same scope as claim 1. It is rejected for the same reasons as for

claim 1.

Together Lecheler and Nelson disclosed all limitations of claims 1-4 and 7-8. Claims 1-4

and 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2.   Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pulsipher

et al. (US 5948055 A), hereinafter referred as Pulsipher, in view of Nelson et al. (US

5577252 A), hereinafter referred as Nelson.

a.   Pulsipher shows (claim 1) a method of managing a computer network, comprising

the steps of: assigning to at least one a collection computer a management domain

identifier uniquely associated with a management domain in which each collection

computer resides; receiving, in at least one management computer, information from

the at least one collection computer that includes the management domain identifier

and a trust flag relating to the management domain identifier; and maintaining within

the at least one management computer a database of the information accessed using

the management domain identifier (Figures 2-5, column 3 lines 16-32, column 7 lines

41-57, column 8 lines 7-24, column 10 lines 13-25). Pulsipher does not explicitly

show (claim 1) a trust flag to indicate a binary setting and deciding whether the at

least one management computer should resolve a hostname being reported by the at

least one collection computer based on the binary setting of the trust flag. However

Pulsipher does show exploration of art and/or provided a reason to modify the method

of managing a computer network with additional features such as the trust/security

feature (column 17 lines 38-51, column 31 lines 50-61).

b.   Nelson shows (claim 1) a trust flag to indicate a binary setting and deciding

whether the at least one management computer should resolve a hostname being

reported by the at least one collection computer based on the binary setting of the

trust flag (column 1 line 54-column 2 line 2; column 6 line 62-column 7 line 18;

column 9 lines 1-23; column 11 line 65- column 12, line 2: name resolution based

upon trust) in an analogous art for the purpose of implementing secure name servers

in an object-oriented system.

c.   It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

the invention was made to modify Pulsipher's functions of distributed internet

monitoring system with Nelson's functions of name resolution based on trust.

d.   The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art

would have been motivated to include the name resolution based on trust technique

per Nelson's teaching in management systems per Pulsipher (column 1, lines 50-59) and Nelson (column 1, lines 14-21)'s teaching.

e. Regarding claim 2, Pulsipher shows wherein the step of assigning comprises the step of: establishing at least one management domain, wherein each management domain includes at least one collection computer (Figure 2, column 6 lines 11-19, column 6 line 65-column 7 line 21).

f. Regarding claim 3, Pulsipher shows wherein the management domain identifier is a domain name of the management domain (column 10 lines 13-25).

g. Regarding claim 4, Pulsipher shows wherein the information is network topology information (Abstract, Figures 2-3B, column 6 lines 52-64, column 7 lines 41-57).

h. Regarding claim 5, Pulsipher shows wherein the step of receiving comprises the steps of: receiving first information from a first collection computer, wherein the first information includes a first network address and a first management domain identifier; receiving second information from a second collection computer, wherein the second information includes a second network address and a second management domain identifier, wherein the second network address is identical to the first network address; comparing the second network address to the first network address using the second management domain identifier and the first management domain identifier; assigning a network element associated with the second network address as a primary network element when the second network address belongs to a different management domain than the first network address; and assigning the network element associated with the second network address as a secondary network element

when the second network address belongs to a same management domain as the first

network address (Figure 2, Figures 8A-8B, Figures 13-15B, column 6 line 65-column

7 line 21, column 10 lines 13-25, column 11 lines 20-31, column 15 lines 33-48).

i.   Regarding claim 6, Pulsipher shows wherein the step of maintaining comprises

the step of: using management domain identifiers to consolidate network topology

information from collection computers having identical network addresses and

belonging to different management domains (Figure 2, column 6 line 65-column 7

line 21).

j.   Regarding claim 7, Pulsipher shows comprising the step of: managing, by each

collection computer, at least one network object; and resolving, by each collection

computer, a network address of each network object into a resolved network address

included in the information received at the at least one management computer

(column 9 line 56-column 10 line 7, column 10 lines 13-25, column 11 lines 8-31).

k.   Claim 8 is of the same scope as claim 1. It is rejected for the same reasons as for

claim 1.

Together Pulsipher and Nelson disclosed all limitations of claims 1-8. Claims 1-8 are

rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

(10)   Response to Argument

In response to appellant's argument on the failure to establish a prima facie case of

obviousness in combining Lecheler and Nelson to reject independent claims 1 and 8 as per item

1 of section VII on page 4 of current Appeal Brief Filed:

1.   Appellant has argued that Nelson does not relate to resolving a hostname should a

trust status indicate the need for a resolution. As claim 1 recites the limitations of

"receiving, in at least one management computer, information from the at least one

collection computer that includes the management domain identifier and a trust flag to

indicate a binary setting" and "deciding whether the at least one management computer

should resolve a hostname being reported by the at least one collection computer based

on the binary setting of the trust flag". Nelson has shows that (column 1 line 54-column 2

line 2) a client requires a named object requests that a context object "resolve" the name

for the object or aborts the name resolution and requires the requesting client to

authenticate itself, i.e. resolve a hostname being reported by the at least one collection

computer; an assurance of security is provided if multiple name servers are involved as

the name resolution trusts, i.e. receiving, in at least one management computer,

information from the at least one collection computer based on trusts by encapsulating

the same principal, i.e. management domain identifier; (column 6 line 62-column 7 line

18): name resolution trust based upon encapsulated principle, i.e. management domain

identifier; (column 9 lines 1-23): get_encapsulated_access reads the binding of

encapsulated principals and its access rights, e.g. "err" and "read", i.e. the "read" is a

trust flag as "FLAGS" in paragraphs 31-32. As one skill in the art knows that bits are

used in a computer algorithm implementation as per Nelson (column 3, lines 6-26) and particularly as per column 9, lines 31-42) Wesley (US 6076114 A), a reference previously cited in office action dated 08/08/2005, on a trust flag is used for indicating a trust communication. Nelson has cited (column 7, lines 5-19) two methods for implementing "trust" name resolution. One of them is using special connection (column 7, lines 5-11). The other is the encapsulation as discussed above. As described in paragraphs 31-32 of applicant's specification, the flags field is set or not for collection station and specified as a part of a command, e.g. xnmtopoconf-add-domain, this is very much similar to the access rights, e.g. "read", used with "principle" as discussed above. Thus Nelson has the argued limitations.

In response to appellant's argument on the failure to establish a prima facie case of obviousness in combining Pulsipher and Nelson to reject independent claims 1 and 8 as per item 2 of section VII on page 6 of current Appeal Brief Filed:

1. Appellant has argued similarly as above on Nelson. Similar responses above should apply.

Additional arts are identified and disclosed in office action dated 01/16/2007, including:

a. Sugauchi et al. (US 6041349 A) System management/network correspondence display method and system therefor

(11) ***Related Proceeding(s) Appendix***

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related

Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer. '

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Peling A Shaw

October 10, 2007

Conferees:

William C Vaughn

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Lynne Browne

PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100